

Date: Mon, 5 Sep 94 22:33:49 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #997
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 5 Sep 94 Volume 94 : Issue 997

Today's Topics:

2m RTPR freqs for Las Cruces, NM/ZiaLink?
 A Repeater on 147.555?!?
Extra features of the Kenwood TH-78A
 IPS Daily Report - 05 September 94
 Kenwood TH79A
 Origin of "Elmer"?
Questions about TV Twin-lead J-Pole
 questions from a beginner (2 msgs)
 Roof mounted antenna
 Santec FM-240

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 6 Sep 1994 04:21:39 GMT
From: yar.cs.wisc.edu!jhanson@rsch.wisc.edu
Subject: 2m RTPR freqs for Las Cruces, NM/ZiaLink?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Could some kind soul please post 2m freqs for Las Cruces? Especially a
connection to ZIA if possible...

--
Jason J. Hanson | 1076 Goss Avenue | (414) 749-1918
State Rep. #55 - Candidate | Menasha, WI 54952-2619 | Ham: N9LEA (Extra)
-- jhanson@yar.cs.wisc.edu =*+*+*= n9lea@wd9esu.#scwi.wi.usa.noam --

Date: 6 Sep 1994 03:01:41 GMT
From: linet02.li.net!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: A Repeater on 147.555?!?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <34di6t\$736@rain.org>, leigh@rain.org (Leigh) says:

>I informed the control operator that both 146.535 and 147.555 were intended
>for FM simplex, under the ARRL band plan. He stated that several local ARRL
>Official Observers had approved the non-standard repeater frequencies.

ARRL OO's have one function: To help amateurs understand and follow the FCC rules.
They can, in
extreme cases of non-compliance, take the matter to the FCC for enforcement, but
they are not,
I repeat, NOT the FCC. Their acceptance of an operation should by no means be
construed to be a legal
precedant or "official" interpretation of the rules. And you can check THAT with
the ARRL.

>Do the "suggested" Band Plans have any meaning any more?! What next: FM
>packet nodes on 144.200 or CW QSOs on repeater inputs?

You'll have to do some digging to find it (perhaps the ARRL Regulatory Info group
can assist), but I
remember reading a decision from the FCC stating that amateurs operating out of
the ARRL Band Plan were
not operating in accordance with "Good Amateur Practice" -- which is in violation
of the Rules. I would
also argue that if the simplex operations on the frequency were regular and
numerous, that the repeater
owner would be in violation of good amateur practice again in causing malicious
interference by not
considering the established use of the frequency. While he may argue that "no one
owns a frequency", he
in effect does now, since no one else can use it for the purpose it had been in use
for.

The FCC decision came due to the fact that the ARRL Band Plan had met with
significant acceptance in the
ham community and since no one else had come up with one!

>Yes, all of the conventional 2 meter repeater pairs in Southern California

>are all used up, and repeater-to-repeater interference is common. But does
>every Ham have a right to have his own repeater? With our crowded,
>limited VHF spectrum, I believe we all should use FM simplex or SSB
>whenever possible.

Yes, every ham has a right to a repeater, as well as anything else his/her license
priviledges convey.

However, if there are no pairs available, there are no pairs available, and then
the coordination issues
come into play.

>Evidently, the local "co-ordinating" group for 2 meters in California, TASMA,
>is having some organizational problems, and will not currently be of much
>help, or so I'm informed.

Same here in NYC area. Problem always seems to be that repeater owners have
friends.. Or themselves.. on
the board...

```
*****
*           :JOE TOMASONE:           GOD IS REAL; UNLESS DECLARED INTEGER      *
* INTERNET: jtomason@li.net           AMPR AX.25: N2MUO@N2BQF.#NLI.NY.USA      *
*****
```

Date: Wed, 31 Aug 1994 17:56:00 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsfeed.pitt.edu!dsinc!ub!
acsu.buffalo.edu!ubvms.cc.buffalo.edu!vp253dhq@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Extra features of the Kenwood TH-78A
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: Mon, 5 Sep 1994 23:08:22 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!msuinfo!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!news.cs.su.oz.au!
metro!ipso!rwc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: IPS Daily Report - 05 September 94
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

SUBJ: IPS DAILY SOLAR AND GEOPHYSICAL REPORT
ISSUED AT 05/2330Z SEPTEMBER 1994 BY IPS RADIO AND SPACE SERVICES
FROM THE REGIONAL WARNING CENTRE (RWC), SYDNEY.
SUMMARY FOR 05 SEPTEMBER AND FORECAST FOR 06 SEPTEMBER - 08 SEPTEMBER

1A. SOLAR SUMMARY

Activity: low

Flares: none.

Observed 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number : 94/40

GOES satellite data for 04 Sep

Daily Proton Fluence >1 MeV: 2.7E+05

Daily Proton Fluence >10 MeV: 1.6E+04

Daily Electron Fluence >2 MeV: 2.3E+06

X-ray background: B1.1

Fluence (flux accumulation over 24hrs)/ cm²-ster-day.

1B. SOLAR FORECAST

	06 Sep	07 Sep	08 Sep
Activity	Low	Low	Low
Fadeouts	None expected	None expected	None expected

Forecast 10.7 cm flux/Equivalent Sunspot Number for 06 Sep: 92/37

2A. MAGNETIC SUMMARY

Geomagnetic field at Learmonth: unsettled

Estimated Indices : A	K	Observed A Index 04 Sep
Learmonth	13 3333 3322	
Fredericksburg	10	3
Planetary	10	4

Observed Kp for 04 Sep: 2111 1212

2B. MAGNETIC FORECAST

DATE	Ap	CONDITIONS
06 Sep	12	Unsettled
07 Sep	16	Unsettled to active
08 Sep	25	Active

COMMENT: IPS Geomagnetic Warning 3 was issued on 4 September and is current for interval 7-10 September. Active levels, with minor storm periods during local night expected 7-10 September due to coronal hole.

3A. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION SUMMARY

	LATITUDE BAND		
DATE	LOW	MIDDLE	HIGH
05 Sep	normal	normal	normal

PCA Event : None.

3B. GLOBAL HF PROPAGATION FORECAST

LATITUDE BAND

DATE	LOW	MIDDLE	HIGH
06 Sep	normal	normal	fair
07 Sep	normal	fair	poor
08 Sep	fair	poor	poor

HF Comms are expected to be degraded after 6 September.

4A. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC SUMMARY

Observed

DATE	T-index	MUFs at Sydney
05 Sep	33	near predicted monthly values

Predicted Monthly T-index for September: 20

4B. AUSTRALIAN REGION IONOSPHERIC FORECAST

DATE	T-index	MUFs
06 Sep	30	Near predicted monthly values
07 Sep	25	Near predicted monthly values
08 Sep	15	10 to 15% below predicted monthly values

COMMENT: IPS HF Communications Warning 2 was issued on 4 September and is current for interval 7-10 September. HF comms conditions are expected to become degraded after 6 September.

--

IPS Regional Warning Centre, Sydney	IPS Radio and Space Services
RWC Duty Forecaster tel: +61 2 4148329	PO Box 5606
Recorded Message tel: +61 2 4148330	West Chatswood NSW 2057
email: rwc@ips.oz.au fax: +61 2 4148331	AUSTRALIA

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 1994 03:44:16 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!herbr@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Kenwood TH79A
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I was just down at the San Diego hamfest and closely looked at all of the dual band HT's. I decided that the 79a was by far and away superior, IMHO, and proudly purchased one.

Excellent HT, you will be very pleased with it.

--

herbr@netcom.com

Date: 6 Sep 1994 03:59:20 GMT
From: tymix.Tymnet.COM!niagara!flanagan@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Origin of "Elmer"?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <778686745.109snx@n2ayj.overleaf.com> n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com (Stan Olochwoszcz N2AYJ) writes:

>I got my license in March, 1979 and Elmer was pretty strongly entrenched
>by then.

Ditto back in 1960 when I got started.

73, Dick

--

Dick Flanagan, W6OLD
dick@libelle.com

w6old@wa6ewv.#nocal.ca.usa.na
CIS:73672,751 GENIE:FLANAGAN

Date: 5 Sep 1994 23:39:56 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!psgrain!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!
prodigy.bc.ca!espresso.prodigy.bc.ca!pantaki@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Questions about TV Twin-lead J-Pole
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I recently posted a requested for instructions one building a TV Twin-lead J-pole antenna. I received many helpful responses that included plans for an antenna by Ed Humphries. I've been trying to build this antenna and I keep messing something up so that the results I get are no better than my standard HT antenna. I was hoping that someone might have some ideas as to what I may be doing wrong. Here are some of the problems I've encountered:

- The TV twin-lead does not lay completely flat so it's difficult to measure (i.e. there's some curvature). How should it be measured?
- Does the exact location of the feedpoint for the coax make a significant difference?
- Will the length of the coax used to feed the antenna make a significant difference?
- I'm using an RG-58U cable with a large connector at one end to which I attach a BNC adaptor. Will this make a difference?
- Is there any way to measure the efficiency of the antenna without using a SWR meter? The only meter I have access to is a Radio Shack meter that measures HF only. Its readings seem to be quite a bit off.

Any assistance would greatly be appreciated.

Paul

Paul Antaki
Prodigy Technologies Corporation Phone: (604) 687-4636
1100-1190 Hornby Street Fax: (604) 687-1671
Vancouver, B.C. e-mail: pantaki@prodigy.bc.ca
V6Z 2K5

Date: Mon, 5 Sep 1994 04:25:24 GMT
From: prism.poly.edu!pzelicof@nyu.arpa
Subject: questions from a beginner
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm beginning to familiarize myself with amateur radio and am interested in getting the technician's license. With this, I have several questions:

1) how is the autopatch service exactly used?
for example, I looked at the 2-meter FM Ham Transceiver sold by Radio Shack, and it says in the catalog that it has "touch-tone (DTMF) dialer and five memories for autopatch". How would one use this radio to make a phone call? And, is autopatch available almost anywhere in the US, well particularly in the Northeastern area?

2) are the Radio Shack radios any good? should I be looking at something more expensive, more powerful, and better?

3) how can I get my appointment set up to take the exam? Does the FCC have the information on the VE's or is there some amateur radio club that I need to call (in the NYC area)?

Thanks for any help, I'll probably come up with some more questions later on...

Date: 6 Sep 1994 00:07:44 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!
wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: questions from a beginner
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <Cvn2yC.M6B@poly.edu>, pzelicof@poly.edu (Paul Zelicof) writes:
|>

|> I'm beginning to familiarize myself with amateur radio and am interested in
|> getting the technician's license. With this, I have several questions:

Welcome to amateur radio! I hope you get all the information you are looking for, and then join this wonderful hobby.

|> 1) how is the autopatch service exactly used?
|> for example, I looked at the 2-meter FM Ham Transceiver sold by Radio Shack,
|> and it says in the catalog that it has "touch-tone (DTMF) dialer and five
|> memories for autopatch". How would one use this radio to make a phone call?
|> And, is autopatch available almost anywhere in the US, well particularly in
|> the Northeastern area?

Some repeaters are connected to phone lines. By transmitting a certain DTMF code to the repeater, a ham can access the autopatch and make phone calls the same as from a touch-tone phone. (Of course, you have to let go of the PTT to listen to the other side of the conversation. :-)

|> 2) are the Radio Shack radios any good? should I be looking at something
|> more expensive, more powerful, and better?

The HTX-202 radios are very good 2 meter HTs. They don't receive out of band, but then they also don't have many of the intermod problems common to wide-band radios. If you're looking for a 2-meter only HT for not too much money, the HTX-202 is a good radio.

|> 3) how can I get my appointment set up to take the exam? Does the FCC have
|> the information on the VE's or is there some amateur radio club that I need
|> to call (in the NYC area)?

Your best bet is to contact a club in your area, or a ham in your area. You can also contact the ARRL and find out when an ARRL-sponsored VE testing session is in your area. (Sorry, but I don't have any info on the NYC area in particular.)

Date: Mon, 5 Sep 94 22:15:43 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Roof mounted antenna
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'm a HAM wanna-be (currently studying for the exam). Wondering about the pros and cons of a roof mounted antenna system for 2 meters. Seems an antenna on top of a 2 story house would be fairly effective. Are there any particulars (grounding, wind, etc) of which I should be extra careful? Thanks for the help!

Date: 5 Sep 1994 21:18 CDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!elroy.uh.edu!st3qi@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu>, <CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<34gbfd\$fml@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

In article <34gbfd\$fml@news.iastate.edu>, wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner)
writes...

>

>In article <CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman)
writes:

>|> 600,000 hams each with their own repeater would use 1.2 million
>|> frequency channels, not counting the frequencies needed for control.
>|> They would be using three times the needed spectrum and certainly more
>|> power than needed to carry out their desired QSO.

>

>OK, but does this mean that a ham who wants to put up a repeater does
>not have the right to do so? Most hams won't because of the expense
>involved, and many also don't care about repeaters, but I don't see why
>they don't have the *right* to do so. It might not be practical,
>or even feasible, but I don't think this means they don't have the
>*right*.

>

>Having the right and exercising it are different things.

I agree with you, Bill. There isn't a rule (that I know of) that
prohibits a ham from constructing a repeater, coordinated or not.

--

Brad A. Killebrew N5LJV, EMT-B	Student of Computer Engr Technology
President, University of Houston ARC	University of Houston, Texas
Internet: n5ljv@uh.edu	U of H Amateur Radio Club WB5FND
AMPRnet : n5ljv@sugarland.ampr.org	uharc@post-office.uh.edu
Packet : n5ljv@f6cnb.#setx.tx.usa.na	Box 85-T2, 4800 Calhoun, 77204-4083
AT&Tnet : 713-743-6676 Fax 743-4032	For info, finger st3qi@jetson.uh.edu

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 1994 02:43:39 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <34gbfd\$fml@news.iastate.edu>,
<5SEP199421180179@elroy.uh.edu>
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

One thing I might add is that most of the current 2M users would think of their radios as useless if all repeaters were to suddenly go QRT. It's a shame to be dependent upon someone else's radio (i.e., The Repeater) in order to value your own.

In a past repeater debate over on .policy someone mentioned he'd bought a dual-band HT; when he found no open repeaters on 440 he said he returned the HT for a 2M-only radio. How sad.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 6 Sep 1994 13:18:15 +1000
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!msuinfo!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!news.cs.su.oz.au!metro!news.ci.com.au!eram.esi.com.au!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu>, <CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<34gbfd\$fml@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

In article <34gbfd\$fml@news.iastate.edu>,
wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:

| OK, but does this mean that a ham who wants to put up a repeater does
| not have the right to do so?

In many countries that I am aware of, this is the case.

--
Dave Horsfall (VK2KFU) | dave@esi.com.au | VK2KFU @ VK2AAB.NSW.AUS.OC | PGP 2.6
Opinions expressed are mine. | E7 FE 97 88 E5 02 3C AE 9C 8C 54 5B 9A D4 A0 CD

Date: 6 Sep 1994 00:00:45 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <CvMsKJ.MB4@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu>,
<CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>a
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

In article <CvoFpF.GL5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

|> 600,000 hams each with their own repeater would use 1.2 million
|> frequency channels, not counting the frequencies needed for control.
|> They would be using three times the needed spectrum and certainly more
|> power than needed to carry out their desired QSO.

OK, but does this mean that a ham who wants to put up a repeater does not have the right to do so? Most hams won't because of the expense involved, and many also don't care about repeaters, but I don't see why they don't have the **right** to do so. It might not be practical, or even feasible, but I don't think this means they don't have the **right**.

Having the right and exercising it are different things.

Date: Tue, 6 Sep 1994 01:41:16 GMT
From: psinntp!isc-newssserver!ultb!jdc3538@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <34di6t\$736@rain.org>, <CvMsKJ.MB4@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu>
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

In article <34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu> wjturner@iastate.edu (William J Turner) writes:

>

>In article <CvMsKJ.MB4@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>|> In article <34di6t\$736@rain.org> leigh@rain.org (Leigh) writes:

>|> >But does every Ham have a right to have his own repeater?

>|> A very good question and the answer certainly must be **NO**.

>

>I know this will start a large debate (at least it looks like it might),
>but I have to ask why does "the answer certainly must be **NO**"? I
>agree that most repeater QSOs could be used on simplex at lower power,
>and thus, technically, they are breaking the law. But, how does this
>make it so each ham does not have a right to have his own repeater?

>

>I would say they probably do have the right, but that exercising it is
>not in the best interests of the ham community at large. I see nothing
>in Part 97 to say every ham **can't** have his (or her) own repeater.
>Please enlighten me and the group on your thinking.

Why must it be "my" repeater? What's wrong with talking on "somebody else's" repeater? Most of them are idle most of the time anyway.

The only place I'd like to see more repeaters are on less-used bands

to entice more people to use something besides 2 meters.

73...Jim N2VNO

Date: Mon, 5 Sep 1994 21:58:26 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <34di6t\$736@rain.org>, <CvMsKJ.MB4@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<34fpr2\$7va@news.iastate.edu>≥p
Subject : Re: A Repeater on 147.555?!?

> (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>|> leigh@rain.org (Leigh) writes:

>|> >But does every Ham have a right to have his own repeater?

>|>

>|> A very good question and the answer certainly must be *NO*.

600,000 hams each with their own repeater would use 1.2 million
frequency channels, not counting the frequencies needed for control.
They would be using three times the needed spectrum and certainly more
power than needed to carry out their desired QSO.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #997
